GPB—15,000-20-12-13

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1898 1899
~~1911~~.
(Mauzrai)

File No. 41

(Section III)

Serial Nos. 1—5

Papers Filed.

*Month*_____

SUBJECT.

File relating to the appointment of to Supervise the affairs of the Sri Vara Seeniva Swami Temple at Suggenahalli Village, Talak.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES. LATER REFERENCES.

Magisterial Department

Note for orders.

Subject :— Petition no 593 dated 22nd December 1901, from Narasimha Pantulu of Suryapanahalli in the Madigubbi Taluk, complaining against the appointment of Dharmadarsis to the Sri Narasimhaswami Temple at Suryapanahalli. Also Petition no 710 dated 2nd February 1902 on the same subject from the residents of Suryapanahalli and other devotees of the Temple.

Seems to have been wrongly dated 2nd January 1902.

This temple is a unique

institution endowed with extensive

Inam lands and no cash

Taxation. Narasimha Bhatachar

the petitioner was the Dharma-

-Karta of the Temple.

2. In 1893 a dispute

arose between the Dharma-

-Karta and the Archak

Ramgachar, regarding the

distribution of the "Nivedyam

rice". The Archak said

that he was entitled to take

the full quantity of the "Nivedyam rice"

(one seer) every day; but

the Dharmakarta, who is

also Aiswaryapurusha of

the temple, and other Temple

-Servants denied his claim

and

and said that they were also entitled to a share of it. The Dharmakartas also complained that the Archak Ramgachari was unfit to be the Archak, being not well versed in Agama; and the Archak brought a complaint against the Dharmakartas, stating that the latter was unauthorizedly enjoying the produce of the Service Inam land of the Archak. The records were sent for from the Dy Commr in 1895, who also submitted an Abstract of the case, clearly explaining the nature of the dispute.

3. The ~~records~~ question

was pending disposal in

this office from 1895 to 1900,

when, in the month of April,

the Dharmakarta gave a

statement before the late

Mangoni Superintendent, that

Archak Ramgachar had been

dismissed about 20 years

ago and that he had not been

doing the duty since then;

that his father Venkata-

-ramajah had been looking

after the Archak's duties

but he also gave it up

as Gumasta 5 or 6 years ago;

and that since then one

Who was well versed in Agama

Ramaswami Bhatta was the

Sujari; and that he was

receiving the full emolu-

-ments of office with the consent of

all the

all concerned.

4. The Estt Surgeon Secretary ~~Secretary~~ made a reference to his statement and observed in his Docket No 228 dated 19th August-1900, Head, as it appeared from the statement Head the father Ramjeeth (Ramgeeher) had left service and one Ramu- - Swamie Bhatta (the Archak) was getting the full quantity of the Nivedanam, no further action was called for in the matter. The Dy Comr was however re- - quested to select and report to this office the names

the names of a few respectable residents of the locality for appointment as Dharmakarsees of the temple.

5. The Dy Commr (Mr M. S. Narayana Rao), recommended the marginally noted 4 persons, which was sanctioned and their names gazetted (vide Notn no 799-800 dated 5th December 1901).

(1) Kuppuswamy
(2) Narayappa
(3) Srinivasa Raghavan
(4) Lakki Singrayyar

6. It is against this order the Dharmakarta has now obtained and he states that he had been the sole Dharmakarta like this ancestors but that now 3 or 4 persons have been newly

newly appointed as Dharma-
-dorsees to the grand-daite-
-ment of the temple work.
He has submitted copies
of a few documents to show
that his father was the sole
Dharmakarta and that
he himself was such on
the death of his father.
Petition no 410 dated 2nd
February 1902 referred to
above, is to the same effect.
Submitted

RS
24/2/02.

7. The petitioner
- Sinha Satwekar
to have been enjoyin

- Issue of the Queen knowledge

of the element is the Simple.

This matter is under

investigation -

- Submitted

29/2/02

Gen. Serial No. 31.]

1894-95.

421

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To

The Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore.

Dated Muzroi Department.
Despatched 12th January 1895.
Received 19th Do
Enclosures—No. 1 & a file.

General No.
D No. 8281

Memo No. 958 dated 3rd July 1893, forwarding for report petition of one Rungiah Archik of the Ranganathswami Temple at Suggunahalli, Magady Talukp.

" .

Referring to the above, has the honor to forward a Memo and to state that as far as the Undersigned is aware Rice offerings is not exclusively use

by any one Servant.
The Archiks claim is
unreasonable and as the
Rice is held in esteem
it should be distributed
among all the Servants
and the Archaryu Purska.
The Archik has a Separate
Pram for his service. He
is but a Gunnasta.

× Dry K. K. P.
" — 4 —
Wet " — 5 — "

For Dy Commissioner

Abstract.

Sugganahalli Narasimhaswamy's Temple case.

This is a long standing dispute between the Archik and the Acharya Purusha or Manager of Sri Narasimha swamy's Temple at Suggunahalli, re-garding the disposal of the Nivadamma rice. This Temple receives no Cash en-dowments from the Government, but it is entirely dependant for its main-tenance on the munificence of the Votaries and on the income from some Inamti lands. A greater portion of these lands have been granted to the Archik and other Temple Servants as remu-neration for their Services. A small portion of these lands has been reserved for the Temple and out of its produce one Seer of rice is given every day for the Nivadamma and the remainder is used for feeding the Votaries and others on extraordinary occasions. Three Khandas

of paddy were delivered into the possession of the Archik once a year, calculated at the rate of one Seer of rice every day, for the purpose of offering the same as Nivadamum to the God. This prasha was found objectionable by the then Amildar in 1875 and it was therefore ordered that the Nivadamum rice should be deposited in the Temple stores and that a seer of rice was to be given every day to the Archik for the said purpose. There was no separate cook for the Temple, so the Archik used to cook the rice and offer it to the God. A Separate Cook was appointed in 1879 and he used to cook the rice and the Archik used to offer it in Nivadamum. The point at issue now is regarding the disposal of the Nivadamum rice. The Archik says that he is entitled to take the full quantity to himself but the Acharya Purusha and other Temple servants deny his claim and say that they are also entitled to a share in it. It is therefore necessary to write a brief Summary of the case

from the beginning in order that the claims of the adverse parties might be thoroughly understood.

One Krishnachar was the hereditary Archik of this Temple. He appointed one Narasimhachar as Gumastah in his place. This Narasimhachar, after some time, suddenly left the service in order to attend to his private affairs at Kumgal. It therefore became necessary to appoint another Archik in the room of the Gumastah Narasimhachar. The hereditary claimant Krishnachar was sent for and with his consent one Venkataramgachar, father of the petitioner, was appointed as Gumastah Archik. This was in 1844. He has been performing the duties as Archik ever since.

In 1858 Archik Venkataramgachar made a complaint to the Taluk Amildar to the effect that the land, the produce of which was allotted for the Nivadamma

rice lay waste on account of the ~~tank~~ bank
under it was situated having breached,
that therefore he found it difficult
to procure the rice for the purposes
of Nivadanum. He requested therefore
that some other arrangement might
be made for the rice to be offered
to the Swamy as Nivadanum. The
Amildar, thereupon issued orders to the
Sheikdar directing that one Seer of rice
should be given every day from the
temple stores for the said purpose.

No 6
22nd.

In 1862, a dispute again arose
regarding the place of cooking of the
Nivadanum rice. The Archik used to cook
the rice in his own house and then bring
it to the Temple for Nivadanum. The
Manager, Rangachar reported that the
practice was objectionable. The Amildar
concurred with the Opinion of the Manager
and he therefore issued orders that the
rice given for Nivadanum should be
cooked in the Temple premises, offered
to the God, and then distributed.

No 79
8th Oct 1862

The matter again cropped up in 1875,
and this time it was about the irregular payment.

payment of rice for the purposes of Nivadanum. Enquiries were held by the Amildar and it was ascertained by him during enquiry that it was the practice to hand over to the Archik at one time once a year, three Khandies of paddy, calculated at the rate of one seer of rice every day. This practice was found objectionable and it was there-fore ordered that the rice should be deposited in the temple stores, that one seer was to be given every day to the Archik for the purpose of cooking it and offering it to the God as Nivadanum. Here also there is no mention made as to how the rice was to be disposed of. Neither is it stated that the Archik was to take it all to himself nor is it stated that it was to be distributed amongst the temple servants.

In the same year, Narasimha Thathachar, the manager of the Temple, otherwise known as Acharya Purusha, submitted a report to the Amildar complaining of the disgrace he was

put to by Archik Rangayya, son of the above named Venkatarangachar in refusing to give him the first "Theertha" to which he and the members of his family were entitled from time immemorial. Enquires were set on foot and it was finally ordered that the Acharya Purusha should be treated with the respect due to his dignity according to Mamool. A notice was also served upon all the servants of the temple prescribing the duties which were required of each of them. It was also ordered that every one of them should be subordinate to the Acharya Purusha and should obey his Commands.

In 1876, the said Narasimha Thathachar made another complaint to the Amildar, stating that the Archik instead of distributing the Nivadamum rice between himself and other Temple servants took it all to himself and when questioned about his conduct in doing so he gave an impertinent reply. The following order was therefore passed

payment

IQ 237

1876. regarding the disposal of the rice in question. The rice cooked everyday for Nivadamum should be offered to the God and should then be distributed amongst the Temple Servants according to Mamool, and the rice offered by the Votaries should be cooked, offered to the God and should then be distributed between the Acharya Purusha, the Votaries and temple servants.

In 1876, the Archik, the Shanbogue and other servants filed a complaint before the Dy Commissioner against the conduct of the Acharya Purusha and about the mismanagement of the temple affairs. This was referred to the Amildar for report. The Amildar then held enquiries and submitted the following report. The complaint is the result of a strong ill feeling existing between the Acharya Purusha and some of the temple servants, especially Archik Rangaiya and Shanbogue Nanjappah. The latter have been making every effort to disgrace the former and to act in violation

of his orders and the former has been trying to manage the temple affairs honestly and conscientiously. The complainants' account of the strict supervision exercised by the Acharya Purusha have not been allowed free scope to do as they like. Hence the complaint which is baseless.

Regarding the Nivadamma rice, the Amildar stated that owing to the insecure state of the temple stores it was deposited in the house of the Acharya Purusha and that one seer was given to the Archik every day for Nivadamma (Here also it is not stated that the Archik was to take it all to himself) and that the balance was used for feeding the votaries during the car festival. This Temple is without any grant from the Government. It is dependent solely on the liberality of the votaries and on the income from some Inamti lands. The present prosperous condition of the Temple is due solely to the exertions of the Acharya Purusha, who has sometimes at his own cost and sometimes through

No. 527
9th Septr. 1876

the Dona
Payne

the donations given by the Votaries through his influence, contributed largely in supplying the necessary Vahanams &c. to the Temple. He takes a deep interest in the Temple affairs and manages them without giving the least trouble to Government. Such a person is entitled to be treated with consideration at the hands of Government. The Amildar was therefore of opinion that the complaint was false and that the Acharya Purusha should be delegate with sufficient powers to make him responsible for the efficient management of the temple affairs.

The suggestions made by the Amildar were approved of by the Dy Commissioner, vide order No. 469 dated 19th December 1876.

In 1879 a separate cook was appointed for the temple. Hitherto the Archik used to cook the rice for Nivadamm, but as this was found inconvenient a separate cook was appointed in that year — Probably there was some hitch regarding the services to be rendered by the temple

Servants, because millfound that in 1880/81 there was a Panchayet held in connection with the temple by which it was decided that certain temple Inamti lands should be distributed amongst the temple servants according to a list or Patti prepared at the time to induce them to carry on their duties regularly. At the foot of this Patti it is stated that if 1¼ Seer of rice is cooked for Nivadamum one Seer should be given to the Archik and the rest distributed amongst the temple servants and if more rice is given the extra quantity should be distributed amongst the temple Servants according to Mamool. The genuineness of this Patti is disputed by the Archaya Purusha and other temple servants. They state that the Patti produced is a forgery and in fact they deny that any Panchayat was held at all. On the other hand the Shanbogue, Nanjappah and the Archik affirm that a Panchayat

payment.

was held and that the document produced is genuine. There is no reference in the records to show whether a Panchayet was held or not and whether the document produced is genuine, excepting the contradictory statements of the adverse parties.

Later on, the said Archik Rangayya filed a Civil suit in 1890 in the Munsiffs' Court at Nelamangala regarding his claim for the Nivadanam rice. The Judgment of the Civil Court is not forthcoming in the records. — Archik Rangayya says that he withdrew the suit on account of material discrepancy in the plaint, but the Archaka Purusha and others assert that the suit was dismissed as his claim could not stand. Here also there is nothing to show which of the statements is true and which false. Neither of the parties have produced the Judgment in the case

re was any discrepancy in the plaint it might have been amended; but the non-production of the Judgment tends more to show that the suit was dismissed than that it was withdrawn.

On failure of the Civil Remedy, probably the petitioner resorted to the Revenue authorities for help.

In 1893 Rangayya, son of Arehik Venkatarangayya presented a petition to the Muzrai Superintendent, stating that according to Memorial 3 Khandes of Paddy were given him once a year, calculated at the rate of 1 Seer of rice every day, that he used to get the same from the year 1844 up to the end of the year 1888, that in the year 1889, Mr. Gopalienger, the then Amildar, issued orders to the lessee of the Temple Inam lands to hand over the 3 Khandies of paddy referred to above to the Archaya Purusha and not to the petitioner, that the petitioner thereupon

payment.

* N.B. Orders to the contrary vide No. 42 dated 3-4-73 referred to above.

thereupon presented a petition to the Talukh Amildar protesting against the above order and that in reply the petitioner was favored with an endorsement to the effect that he might establish his claim before a proper Court. The petitioner thereupon appealed both to the Dy Commissioner and to the Muzri Assistant against the above order and that none of them have been pleased to pass any orders. He Requested therefore that orders might be issued to the Dy Commissioner to make full enquiries regarding his claim and to pass early orders on the subject.

No 48
10th July 1893.

The Muzri Superintendent forwarded the above petition to the Dy Commissioner for disposal and the Dy Commissioner sent it on to the Amildar of Nasadry for report

On Receipt of the above order, the Amildar sent for the parties in question and made enquiries of them

Regarding the matter mentioned in the petition.

The petitioner Rangaiyya stated as follows:- His father Venkata Rangachar was appointed as Archik in 1844. From the date of his appointment up to the end of the year 1888, he was receiving 3 Khandis of paddy every year for the purposes of daily Nivadamm and this was calculated at the rate of one Seer of rice every day. He cooked the rice, offered to the God and then took away the whole quantity himself. In 1889, the then Amildar Mr. Gopalengar issued orders to the lessee of the temple lands to deliver the 3 Khandis of rice into the possession of the Archarya Purusha. A Civil Suit was filed regarding the 3 Khandis of rice, but as there was some material discrepancy in the plaint, the suit was withdrawn. A separate cook, namely one Thathachar, brother of the Archarya Purusha was appointed in the year 1879. The petitioner cooked

payment.

the Nivadamum rice on ordinary days and the Cook Cooked it on extra ordinary days. The Acharya Purusha directed that only 1/4th seer of rice should be taken by the Archik and that the rest should be distributed amongst the temple servants. This, he refused to do, as it was against the Mamool. Hence the dispute. He further stated that the Archik alone was entitled to the full one seer of Nivadamum rice and quoted the Award of the Punchayet referred to above. He denied that the Nivadamum rice was ever distributed amongst the temple servants, excepting on extra-ordinary occasions.

Narasimha Thatthacharya, on the other hand stated that at no time was the Archik allowed to take the full quantity of the Nivadamum rice to himself. When there was no separate Cook in the temple, the Archik used to Cook the rice himself, offer it to the God, and then after distributing a portion of it amongst the Acha...

Purushea and other temple servants took the balance to himself. After the appointment of a separate cook the same practice was followed, except that the cook cooked the rice instead of the Archik. He denied in toto the claim of the Archik for the full one seer of Nivadanum rice and further stated that the Archiks claim for the above was dismissed by the Munsiff of Nelamangala as groundless. He asserted that the Manood was to distribute the Nivadanum rice, more on account of its religious efficacy than on account of its being a source of livelihood.

Shenbogue Nanjappah, corroborated the statement of the petitioner in all material points. He stated that the Archik was entitled to one seer of rice every day for Nivadanum, that he used to take the whole quantity home himself, that he has never seen it distributed amongst the temple servants, that it was only in 1889 that the dispute arose regarding the distribution of payment

of the rice in question. He stated also that the archik was receiving 3 Khandies of rice once a year for the Nivadanum rice, and that this practice was discontinued ever since 1889. He produced certain temple accounts in support of his allegations. In the accounts it is simply stated that 3 Khandies of Paddy were given to the Archik for the purpose of Nivadanum. No mention is made in the accounts as to how it was to be distributed or how it was to be disposed of after the Nivadanum was over.

No. 58
28th Decr 93.

The Amildar then submitted his report, embodying the purport of the statements given by the petitioner and others, as stated above, and stating that he would submit a further detailed report after local investigation.

No. 615.
1st Febry 94.

The following order was then passed by the Muzrai Assistant Commissioner. It is clear from the records that it is the practice in this temple to distribute the Nivadanum rice amongst the

Acharya Purushas and other temple servants. The same practice is prevailing. Similarly in other temples in the Province. So steps must be taken to observe the Mamool practice in this temple also. It is also to be noted that separate Inamti lands have been assigned to the Archik for his Services. The Amildar was requested to report whether there were any previous references to shew that the Archik was entitled to this Prasadam.

The Amildar then reported that there was no reference at all to shew the Archik's claim for Prasadam

On receipt of this report, the following further order was passed by the Mazra Assistant:- The documents produced by the petitioner and the defendant Thathachar do not throw any light at all in the case. There is no reference in the records to shew that the Archik alone is entitled to the full quantity of the Nivadamum rice, nor is there

No. 902
7th May 194

payn

any reference to show how it was to be distributed. The simple statement in the accounts to the effect that one seer of rice was given to the Archik every day does not necessarily imply that he alone was entitled to the whole of the Nivadamum. The Amildar was therefore called upon to submit a further detailed report regarding the practice prevailing in other temples elsewhere in the province, whether there were any references to shew the custom prevailing in this temple and as to how the Inamti lands had been distributed amongst the temple servants.

The Amildar, thereupon, held further enquiries in the matter and ascertained through the petitioner Ramsamyja that the custom in the larger temples in the province was to distribute the Prasadam amongst the temple servants, that those temples had large cash endowments from the Government and that the quantity of rice given every day for Nivadamum was from 4 to 5 seers a day.

of Narasimhaswamy had no cash endowments that only one seer of rice was allowed every day for Nivadamum, and that therefore the Archik alone was according to custom entitled to the full quantity himself. He denied also that the rice was ever distributed amongst the temple servants. He relied only on the award of the Punchayet, the genuineness of which, as stated above, was already disputed by the adverse party. The Shambogue made a similar statement and corroborated the Archik's statements on all points. The Acharya Purusha and all the other temple servants affirmed that the practice was to distribute the prasadam amongst all the servants. They denied the genuineness of the document, purporting to be the award of the Punchayet. They, in fact stated that no punchayet was held at all. The temple accounts produced by the Shambogue made mention no mention as to how the Nivadamum rice was to be disposed of. They

further payment.

further stated that the mere entry
in the temple accounts that so much
rice was given to the Archik for the
purposes of Niwadanum does not
necessarily imply that he was to
take it all to himself without
distributing it amongst the other
temple Servants. They saw no special
reason why the Archik alone should
have been shown greater favor, when
in addition to the Guanti lands
assigned to him for rendering his
services, he had large cash income
from the Votaries. The rice given for
Niwadanum was derived exclusively
from the produce of an Guanti land
specially set apart for the purpose.
According to the principles of their religion
it was necessary to partake at least
a small portion of the Niwadanum
offered to God, and that therefore the
practice was to distribute it amongst
the temple servants. All the servants
excepting the petitioner and the Shanbogue
asserted that the practice of dis-
-tributing the Niwadanum amongst

them was prevailing from a long time -

In the meanwhile, however, the Votaries and some of the Servants of the temple presented petitions both to the Dy Commissioner and to the Amildar in June 1894 denying the claim of the Archik for the whole of the "prasadam" and stating that the customs in this as well as in other temples all over the province, was to distribute the Nivadamm amongst the temple servants and others. They denied also the genuineness of the document produced as being the award of the Panchayets. They stated that separate Inamte lands had been assigned to the Archik for his services and that therefore he had no exclusive right for the Nivadamm rice. The petitioner was not the Amkdar, but was only a Gumastah. They requested therefore that a man learned in the Mantras and capable of discharging

the duties satisfactorily might be appointed in the place of the petitioner, Rangayya.

The petitions presented to the Dy Commissioner were forwarded to the Muzrai Assistant for disposal and those presented to the Amildar were also forwarded to the same Officer for orders.

No 19
5th Novr 1944

The Amildar, in forwarding the records to the Muzrai Assistant, submitted the following report:-

He stated that out of the one seer of rice given every day for Nivadamm half the quantity might be allowed to be taken by the Archik and the remaining half distributed amongst the temple servants. Half a seer of rice is not sufficient to the Archik for his maintenance. He proposed therefore that the quantity of the Nivadamm rice might be increased by 1/4th of a seer, that out of the increased quantity, the Archik might be allowed to take 3/4th of a seer to himself and that the remaining

1/2 a Seer might be distributed amongst the other temple Servants. The Acharya Purusha and other temple servants claim a share in the Nivadamm, only on account of its religious respect and efficacy.

On receipt of the report stated above, the Mugvi Assistant has submitted a memo to the Dy Commissioner, setting forth the facts of the case. He states that the practice in other temples in the other parts of the Province is to distribute the Nivadamm rice amongst all the temple servants. The practice appears to be the same in this temple also as is evident from the depositions of the Acharya Purusha and other temple Servants. He disapproves of the proposal made by the Amildar to show some special concession to the Archik, on the ground that separate Inam lands have been assigned to him for his Services and that he enjoys also other privileges.

Copy.

S. Narasimhaya
for Dy Commissioner.

MUZRAI

189 SC2—

From

To

The Dy Commissioner,

Bangalore District

Dated 19th

Despatched 21st aug 1900

Received

General No. 228

Muzrai F. No. 41-98

Enclosure No. 1 Pet.

His docket No. 828 dated 12th January 1895 reporting on the petn of Rangiah, archak of the Sri Narasimhaswami temple at Suggenahalli Nagadi Taluk, complaining that ~~he is not~~ the Acharyaheruvu of the temple does not allow him to take the entire quantity of the Nivedanam.

With refee to the above,
has the honor to state
that as from the written
Statement ~~made by the~~
made ~~before the undersigned~~
made in this office by the
Acharya purusha of the
temple it appears that
the late Rangiah has left
service and one Ramaswamy
Bhatta who is now doing
the duties of the archak is
getting the full quantity
of the Nivedanam, no further
action is now called for in
the matter.

2. The Dy Comr is however requested to select and report to this office the names of a few resident of the locality for appointment as the Mad arsees of the temple

3. The enclosures to his docket cited above are herewith returned.

B. O.

Asst Secy

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 22-11-01
REG. No. 332
MUZRAI BRANCH

SC3 1901/1902

FROM C. *Dy. Commissioner,*
Bangalore District.

To The Dy Secy to the
Govt of Mysore
Rev & Genl Depts

Dated 21st
Despatched 22nd } November 1901

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

Late Muzrai Secretary's docket
No 228 of the 17th August 1901.
Submits the name of those
that may be appointed as
Dharmadarsee of Sri
Narasimha Swami Temple at the
Sugguvahalli [illegible]

Bangalore District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore Cantt. St. November 1909

From,

M. S. Narayan Rao Esqr
Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To

L. Ananda Rama Rao Esqr
Dy Secy to the Govt of Mysore
Rev: and Genl Depts.

Sir,

With reference to the late Mysore Secretary's docket No. 228 dated 19th August 1909, requesting to select and report a few names for the appointment of Dharmadarsees to the temple of Narasimha Swami in the Seegenahalli village, Magadi Taluk, I have the honor to note in the margin the names of four persons recommended for appointment as Dharmadarsees.

1 Kahnipattiah, Patel of Hunkal and Landlord
2. Rangaphiah retired Amildar and Landlord
3. Srinivasa Raghavachar, Acharya Purusha, } Landlord
4. Patti Singe Gowda Land Lord and Patel.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

M. S. Narayan Rao

Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

Sl 6

Notification

No. 799
Mur 741.98
× No 800
Mur 741.98
Dy 5th December 1901

The undermentioned persons are appointed Dharmadarsees to supervise the affairs of the Sri Narasimhaswami temple in the Suggunahalli village, Nagadi Taluk:-

1. M.R.Ry Kapinipathiah. Patel of Hunkal & Landlord
2. " Nanjapiah, Retd. Amildar Accountant.
3. " Srinivasa Rajavadhen (Acharya Purusha) landlord.
4. " Patti Sangre Gowda - landlord & Patel.

By order

4/12/01
Dy Secy
Revs Dept

To The Compiler, Mysore Gazette
for publication in Engl: & Kan.

Copy to the Dy Commr, Bangalore - for inf[n] with ref[ce] to his letter No 592 dy 21st Nov[r] 1901.

B.O.

Dy Secy

MUZRAI

~~1901~~

From

THE SECRETARY TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

To

The Dy Commr
Bangalore Dt.

Dated 9 July 1903.

Despatched

Received

General No. 83 & 84

Muzrai F. No. 41-98

Enclosure No. 2 & Encls.

Petn no 710.
Petn no 593 with its encls

In forwarding here-
-with the marginally
noted petns with enclos
(to be obliged & returned)
from Narasimha Tatacha
Acharyaparumsha of the
Sri Narasimhaswamy
temple at Sugganahalli
in the Magadi Taluk
protesting against the

MGCPB—11-1-1901—1500

appointment of the
Dharmadarsees notified
in this Office no. 799-800
Mur 741-98
dated 5th December 1901,
on the ground that the
Petr. and his ancestors
have been from time immemorial
the sole Dharmakartas
of the Instn., has the honor
to request that the Dy Commr.
will be so good as to institute
enquiries into the claim
of the Petr. & submit a
detailed report together
with his opinion in the
matter for orders of Govt.

By order
8/1/03

8/1/03 Dy Secretary
Mur Deptt

Endl. as Petn